



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/818,245 03/14/97 OGINO

H B208-629-CON

EXAMINER

LM31/0224

JAMES J DALEY
ROBIN BLECKER DALEY ADN DRISCOLL
330 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10017

BELLA, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2721

DATE MAILED:

02/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

02/E18,245

Applicant(s)

Ogino, et al.

Examiner

Matthew C. Belle

Group Art Unit

2721

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec. 13, 1999.
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 3-4, 7, 38, 40, 42-50 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 3-4, 7 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 38, 40, 42-50 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2721

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 38, 40, and 42-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 38, 40, and 42-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami (5,696,840) in view of Nagasaki et al (5,153,730) and in further view of Outa (4,922,335).

As to claim 38, Usami shows an image processing system, comprising;
a memory means for storing an image signal outputted from an image pickup means (fig. 1, element 8 and col. 11, lines 25-29);
reproducing means for reproducing the image signal stored by the memory means (fig. 1, output of element 8);

Art Unit: 2721

producing a color correction table (i.e, color balance control) on the basis of a first image signal (fig. 1, element 9);

a signal correcting means for correcting the color balance of a second image signal reproduced by the reproducing means on the basis of the color balance control data, the second image signal being different than the first signal (col. 2, lines 35-53, reusing the system).

Usami does not disclose a detachable memory. Nagasaki teaches producing correction data by Y-C separation, filtering and the like, on the signal read from a memory card 34 and supplied to it through a common bus (col. 6, lines 31-57). A memory card being detachable for increased memory capacity and a transportable memory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill for Usami to use a detachable memory in place of attached memory, because Nagasaki teaches memory cards are used to download image data to be corrected for increased memory capacity and transportable memory.

Usami also does not teach selecting color balance control from an image displayed. Outa teaches selecting and more accurately correcting color balance by selecting color balance control from an image displayed (col. 32, lines 21-50 and col. 40, lines 23-37). It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the art for Usami to use select color balance control from an image displayed, as taught by Outa, to selectively and more accurately correct an image color balance.

As to claim 40, Usami further shows holding means, ROM 13, for holding the reference information, signal processing means performing a processing on image signals other

Art Unit: 2721

than the image signal used to produce the reference information, on the basis of the reference information held by the holding means.

As to claim 42, Usami further shows designating means designates correcting data on the basis of the reference signal (col. 2, lines 45-50).

As to claim 43, Usami further shows, holding means, CPU 7 and ROM 13, for holding the correction data, signal processing means performing a processing on image signals other than the reference signal on the basis of the correction data held by the holding means (see col. 2, lines 45-50).

As to claim 44, Usami further shows a displaying means for displaying an image associated with an image signal outputted from the signal processing means (fig. 1, monitor 12).

As to claims 45-50, they recite on what is discussed above regarding claims 38, 40-44.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7, 3, and 4 are allowable over the prior art of record.
5. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Control information is copied from second memory means to the first memory means when the second memory means is removed from the apparatus. When third memory means is attached to the apparatus, control information copied from second memory means to first

Art Unit: 2721

memory means is copied from first memory means to third memory means, in combination with other limitations of claim is not shown or suggested by the prior art.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ohnishi et al (5,631,983) teach correcting the color balance from an image selected on a display.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Bella, whose telephone number is (703) 308-6829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo H. Boudreau, can be reached on (703) 305-4706. The fax number for this Group is (703) 306-5406.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

MCB
February 22, 2000

MATTHEW BELLA
PATENT EXAMINER

